DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 175 CS 211 268

AUTHOR Ervin, R. Ferrell
TITLE Outcomes Assessment: The Rationale and the Implementation.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Tests; Departments; *Educational Assessment; Educational Legislation; Educational Research; Followup Studies; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Journalism; Mass Media; Mastery Tests; *Outcomes of Education; *Program Effectiveness; Standardized Tests
IDENTIFIERS Kentucky; Missouri; Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Based on the increased public pressure of the governors in Missouri, Tennessee, and Kentucky for higher education to make significant strides in "outcomes assessment," a national survey of the 361 colleges and universities identified in the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication directory as having undergraduate and/or graduate programs in journalism and mass communication was conducted during a 30-day period in February/March of 1988. A total of 181 usable responses to this exploratory study revealed that outcomes assessment were being used in 71 (39%) of the schools responding. In places where the question of "value added" education has not yet surfaced, teacher-made examinations, finals, or projects suffice as assessment instruments. The most often used assessment was reported to be the locally created course evaluation created within an academic unit and conducted at the conclusion of a semester, in which the student evaluates the worth of the academic experience. In a few instances, a variety of standardized tests was administered as measurement tools. Although 13 of the schools used some form of measure prior to 1980, most universities reported that faculty often resist measurement of student achievement because it might imply poor teaching rather than lackluster student achievement. In addition, faculty resent the rush, lack of pretesting, and difficulty in determining appropriate passing scores that locally produced instruments might create. Findings also revealed that a small group of schools utilize alumni job surveys. (Sixteen references are attached, as well as three tables of data resulting from previous studies.) (ARH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295175

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

The Rationale and the Implementation

R. Ferrell Ervin
Department of Mass Communication
Southeast Missouri State University

Paper Presented
ASJMC Administrators' Paper Session
of the
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

Portland, Oregon

July, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Ferrell Ervin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS211268

When the National Governors Association met in 1986, their agenda included reports from seven task forces calling for action and reform in education. The Task Force on College Quality offered six major recommendations pertaining to assessment which could significantly impact all college and university administrators at public institutions.

These recommendations included:

"(1) Governors, state legislatures, state coordinating boards, and institutional governing boards should clearly define the role and mission of each institution of public higher education in their state. Governors should also encourage the governing board of each independent college to clearly define its mission.

(2) Governors, state legislatures, coordinating boards, administrators, and faculties should reemphasize the fundamental importance of undergraduate instruction --especially in universities that give high priorities to research and graduate instruction.

(3) Each college and university should implement systematic programs that use multiple measures to assess the learning of undergraduates. The information gained from such assessments should be used to evaluate the quality of the institution and of this program. Information about institutional and program quality should also be made available to the public.

(4) Governors, state legislatures, and statewide coordinating boards should adjust funding formulas for public colleges and universities to provide incentives for improving the learning of undergraduate students, based on the results of comprehensive assessment programs. Independent colleges and universities should be encouraged to do likewise.

(5) Governors, state legislatures, coordinating boards, and governing boards should reaffirm their strong commitment to access to public higher education for students from all socioeconomic backgrounds.

(6) The higher education accrediting community should require colleges and universities to collect and use information about student outcomes among undergraduates. Demonstrating levels of student learning and performance should be consideration for institutional accreditation." (National Governors Association, 1986)

One of the obvious outcomes has been the placing of increased emphasis on outcomes assessment which measure the value added by a course of study in a college or university for graduating students.

History of Comprehensive Examinations in U.S. Higher Education

Current interest is an apparent cyclical occurance. The literature indicates a practice of examining students at various stages of their educational career to measure or assess their extent of learning began with the earliest educational practices in America.

Our colonial colleges conducted annual public recitations that tested factual content based on rote memorization rehearsed daily over the course of a school year. (Rudolph, 1978) The University of Virginia was perhaps the first university to require passage of general exit exams at the end of a student's academic career rather than material covered during a single academic year. (Levine, 1978) Yale, in the 1830's had established written exams that were conducted at two points (sophomore and senior years), and allowed comparisons of the development of a class of students. (Smallwood, 1935)

Testing during these periods was clearly simplified because of the regimented course of study dictated by faculty which required classical literature, philosophy and mathematics. The use of these examinations actually declined with the introduction of the "elective system" at Harvard College in the 1890's, which spread to other institutions (Jones, 1933). Comprehensive examinations were revived prior to 1920 and grew in interest for the next 40 years. Perhaps influenced by European philosophy, Whitman College in Washington introduced oral examinations in 1913, on

the entire content of their students' major study. The President, Stephen Penrose believed it a reasonable expectation that his college's graduates know enough about a field of study to discuss it intelligently. By 1919, Harvard required all majors to pass an exam covering materials that were relevant to, but not necessarily covered, in their course of study.

The literature contains several interesting studies of the use of comprehensive examinations (exams in the major, general comprehensive, senior comps), although the populations surveyed varies from private religious institutions to liberal arts colleges and the techniques utilized are varied.

Table 1

HISTORICAL PATTERN OF SENIOR COMPREHENSIVE TESTING IN THE U. S.

Source (publication date)	Year of data collection	Percent using comp. exams at senior level	Number of responding institutions
Jones (1933)	1933	13%	654 accredited institutions
Dressel & DeLisle (1969)	1957	33%	322 4-year liberal arts colleges
Dressel & Associates (1961)	1959	52%	466 liberal arts colleges
Singletary (1968)	1968	33%	946 liberal arts institutions
Dressel & DeLisle (1969)	1969	40%	322 4-year liberal arts colleges
Levine (1978)	1975	24%	270 colleges and universities

Note: While each study used a different sampling frame and different approaches for gathering data, these independently conducted surveys suggest an ebb and flow of interest in comprehensive testing at the senior level. (Banta and Schneider, 1986)

The Issues in Assessing Outcomes

It is clear that the principle purpose of comprehensive examinations has been as a measurement instrument designed to assess the levels of learning attained by individual students. This would, however, change in the future. Our current

national interest in outcomes assessment has created attention on examinations which can provide evidence of quality educational programs rather than merely assess the level of a student's attainment.

A 1987 survey examined initiatives to assess student and institutional performance across the 50 states and found that (1) "nearly two-thirds of the state boards indicated that explicit statewide assessment programs were planned or already in place, (2) statewide assessment programs vary greatly across the nation, (3) more than half the state boards see their role as one of actively encouraging, promoting or facilitating institutional initiatives in assessment and outcomes measurement." (Boyer, etal.) Many educators fear any form of examinations: (1) exams are "primarily hashed-over textbook items and . . . do not sample enough data to insure mastery of the material; and (2) "examining is artificial" -- exams that merely assess mastery of factual content neglect other valuable aspects of the curriculum (p. 15). Other scholars have noted (3) faculty often resent the time required to prepare, administer, and evaluate exams, and (4) students may lack sufficient experience and preparation for the task of performing adequately on an intergrative test of accumulated knowledge. (Banta and Schneider, 1986)

Table II

Advantages of Local and National Testing Instruments

Standardized Tests	Faculty-Developed Tests
1. Save faculty time	1. Reflect local curriculum
2. Provide norms for comparing scores	2. Valuable tool for planning and curricular review
3. Theoretically resolve questions of credibility/validity	3. Involve faculty input

Essay and objective tests are available commercially in some fields. For those fields in which commercially developed tests are not available, faculty-developed tests are an alternative that may be used.

Table III

Disadvantages of Objective and Essay Comprehensive Examinations

Objective	Essay
1. Limited coverage of content	1. Guidelines for scoring
2. Test construction costly	2. Enforcement of guidelines
3. Security concerns require frequent rewriting	3. Time for grading

These educational issues are especially troubling for the mass communication administrator who may find himself/herself facing the task of creating a workable, valid system of assessment using research methodology that allows easy reporting of the relative strengths and weaknesses of an institution and its curricular offerings.

The Study

Based on the increased public pressure of the governors in Missouri, Tennessee, and Kentucky for higher education to make significant strides at "outcomes assessment", a national survey of the 361 colleges and universities identified in the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Directory as having undergraduate and/or graduate programs in journalism and mass communication, was conducted during a 30-day period in February/March of 1988.

A total of 181 usable responses to this exploratory study revealed the use of outcomes assessment currently utilized in 71 (39⅜) of the schools responding. The local definition of outcome assessment, however, is clearly a problem where the question of "value added" education has not yet surfaced. In those locations, regularly scheduled teacher-made examinations, finals, or projects suffice as assessment instruments.

One respondent typified the confusion, "Tests and writing assignments are given on a regular basis. That is our "outcome assessment."

The most often used assessment was reported to be the locally created course evaluation created within an academic unit and conducted at the conclusion of a semester in which the student consumer evaluates the worth of the academic

experience (both content and presentor).

In a limited number of instances, the ACT, Cooperative English Exam (COOP), or general examination of the GRE are administered as a measurement tool because of the "broad liberal arts philosophy that is so clearly a part of the journalism/mass communication education." Yet these same administrators who utilized these standardized examinations believed they were probably inappropriate as a measure of achievement in most courses identified with advertising, broadcasting, journalism prefixes in college catalogues. One administrator candidly revealed that these standardized exams provide easy scoring but that the questions asked did not report how much his graduates had learned but "the GRE satisfied the Provost. If it satisfies his interest we don't want to rock the boat." A response from Tennessee where outcome assessment has been widely implemented was that most examinations simply "do not cover writing or critical thinking, the most important skills of our program."

Although 13 of the schools revealed use of some form of measure prior to 1980, most universities reported that faculty often resist measurement of student achievement because it "might imply poor teaching rather than 'lack luster student achievement." Faculty resent the rush, lack of pretesting, difficulty in determining appropriate passing scores that locally produced instruments might create. "After searching for an appropriate instrument, we have bowed to the administration's recommendation that we construct our own instrument unique to this campus."

A small group of schools utilize alumni job surveys. The procedure calls for a close contact of the school with its alumni and assorted media locations. "We contact employers of our alumni and ask how our graduates compare with other recent hires. If the employers like what they see, we figure our courses are on target, if not, we'd better fix the courses or nobody will look at what comes through our pipeline!" The procedure gives credence to the notion that "if students satisfactorily complete each course for which they receive credit, further evaluation or paperwork is unnecessary for faculty or students."

While there is obviously a need to monitor graduate performance in the job

market, these alumni surveys may not take into account (1) sluggish economy affecting positions available, (2) control for the ebb and flow of student abilities as they enter academic programs, or (3) account for the general awareness of individual program capabilities. This final point has lead administrators at Alabama, Central Florida, and Eastern Illinois to suggest that the "accreditation process which evaluates programs on every conceivable variable is a wonderful outcome assessment instrument."

Recommendation

Because of the increasingly expressed interest of politicians in "outcome assessment", public institutions can expect to face continuing pressure to implement a formalized measurement system. Those institutions where the concept is new will need to turn to sister institutions where formalized testing methods are now in existence to meet immediate need for assessment. In addition, this is the appropriate time for journalism and mass communication units to band together to create a specialized examination that will be administered uniformly on the undergraduate academic level.

References

Aschcroft, J. "Does a Degree Tell Us What a Student Has Learned?" Phi Delta Kappan. 1986, 68, 225-227

Astin, A.W. Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Banta, T. W. "Use of Outcomes Information at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville." In P. T. Ewell (Ed.) Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Sept., 1985.

Banta, T. W. and Schneider, J. A. "Using Locally Developed Comprehensive Exams for Majors to Assess and Improve Academic Program Quality" Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. April 19, 1986.

Dressel, P. L. and DeLisle, F. Undergraduate Curriculum Trends. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Dressel, P. L. and Associates. Evaluation in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

Dressel, P. L. Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Jones, E. S. Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges. New York: MacMillan, 1933.

Levine, A. Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Lowell, A. L. "General Exams and Tutors at Harvard College." Educational Record, 1927, 8 (April), 64-67.

Lowell, A. L. "Examination of Subjects Instead of by Courses." Harvard Graduate Magazine, 1912, 20 (30), 584-585.

National Governors Association. Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, D.C.: National Governors Association

O'Neill, J. P. "Examinations and Quality Control." In J. R. Warren (Ed.) Meeting the New Demand for Standards. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, September, 1983.

Rudolph, F. Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Singletary, O. A. (Ed.) American Universities and Colleges (10th ed.) Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Smallwood, M. L. A Historical Study of Examinations and Grading Systems in Early American Universities. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
TX	Abilene Christian University (Dept. of Journ. & M.C.) [262]	Y	IC ES	Course Eval.	1970	Fac. accept-ance	Y				
CO	Adams State College (English & Journ.) [40+]	Y	IC ES	Student Eval.	approx. 1981	Class person-ality	N	Student Eva. are emphasized in rehiring decisions.		N/A	
OH	Akron, Univ. of (Dept. of Comm.) [850]	N							N		
AK	Alaska @ Anchorage Univ. of, (Journ. & Public Comm.) [172]	Y	IC	Tests & finals, reports, projects					Y	Undecided	
AK	Alaska @ Fairbanks Univ. of, (Media Services) [0]	Y	IC	Students' opinion of instr.	1979	Fac. resist-ance.	Y				
MI	Alma College (Dept. of Speech Comm.) [9]	N			1973	ambig-uous	N	Not fair			
DC	American University (School of Comm.) [850]	N							N		
NC	Appalachian State Univ. (Dept. of Comm. Arts) [734]	N							N		
IN	Anderson College (Comm. Dept.) [90]	N							N		
AZ	Arizona State Univ. (Cronkite School of Journ. & Telecomm.) [1,150]	N							N		
AR	Arkansas Tech Univ. (Dept. of Speech, Theatre & Journ.) [46]	Y	IC	Finals, created by indi-vidual instructors, non-stand-ardized.			Y		N		
AR	Arkansas @ Fayetteville Univ. of, (Comm. Dept.) [410 undergrad.; 25 grad.]	N							N		
AL	Auburn University (Speech Comm.) [460]	Y	IC ES	Exams			Y		N		
IN	Ball State University (Ctr. Comm. Sci.) [?]										
WV	Bethany College (Dept. of Comm.) [15]	Y	TU SA	Sr. comp. exam	Early '70s						

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
SD	Black Hills State College (Comm. Division) [300; 120 Mass Comm.]	Y	BA						Y developing	In development	May '89.
PA	Bloomsburg University (Dept. of Mass Comm.) [220]	N							Y		
ID	Boise State University (Comm. Dept.) [406]	Y	IC SA	Varies	1971	N	Y	Lacks precision.			
IL	Bradley University (Dept. of Comm.) [46]								N		
CT	Bridgeport, Univ. of (Mass Communication) [84]	N							Y		
UT	Brigham Young University (Dept. of Communication) [800]	N							N		
NY	Buffalo State Univ. College (Journ., Broadcasting & Speech) [325]	N							N		
IN	Butler University (Dept. of Journ.) [37]	N		Fac. eval., course evaluations.							
PA	Cabrini College (English & Comm.) [150]								Y		
CA	California Polytechnic University (Comm. Arts) [500]	Y	IC	Student Eval.	1975	Lack of resp. determining meaning.	N	Lack of development & student participation.			
CA	California @ Berkeley University of (Mass Communication) [100+]	Y	IC ES	Student Eval.	Early '80s		Y				
CA	California State Univ. @ Chico (ISCT Dept.) [700]	N							N		
CA	California State Univ. @ Fresno (Telecommunications) [175]	N							N		
CA	California State Univ. @ Fullerton (Comm. Dept.) [2,000]	N							N		
CA	California State Univ. @ Long Beach (Radio, TV & Film Dept.) [500]	Y	IC ES TU SA	Tests, Prod.proj. Research	?	None	Y/N	No statistical/ qualitative judgment.			

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
CA	California State Univ. @ Northridge (Journalism) [600]	N							N		
CA	California State Univ. @ Sacramento (Comm. Studies Dept.) [1,200]	N							N		
NY	Canisus College (Comm. Dept.) [?]	Y						Send then call & discuss.			
AR	Central Arkansas, University of (Dept. of Speech, Theatre & Journ.) [180]	Y	IC	Exams.	1907	None	Y				
FL	Central Florida, University of (School of Comm.) [900]	N							N	Rely on 5-year review by external review team.	
GA	Clark College (Mass Communication) [700+]	Y	IC TU ES SA	Dept. exam & GRE.	12 years		Y				
IA	Clarke College (Communication) [20]	Y	SA	Senior perf. project. Presentation of outcome.			Y		N		
CO	Colorado @ Boulder, University of (School of Journ. & M.C.) [385]	N							Y	?	1991
CO	Colorado State Univ. (Speech Comm.) [338]								N		
IL	Columbia College (Television Dept.) [789]	Y	IC S ES EY	Reviews by students & instr.	1980		Y	Continuously being evaluated.			
CT	Connecticut, Univ. of (Dept. of Comm. Sci.) [610 Jr's. & Sr's. only]	N							N		
NY	Cornell University (Dept. of Communication) [310]	Y	IC ES		Approx. 1978	None	Y				
NE	Creighton University (Journ. & M.C.) [60 Jr. & Sr.]	N							Y	In talking stage.	?
OH	Dayton, University of (Dept. of Communication) [750 u.g.; 50 grad.]	Y	TU SA	Univ.-wide instrument w/section for major programs		Dist.	Y				
IN	Defense Info. School (Research & Eval. Div.) [250 u.g.; 100 grad.]	Y	IC EY SA	Questionaires mostly.	Approx. 1976		Y	Questionaires revised annually.			

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
DL	Delaware, University of (Communication) [650]	N							N		
CO	Denver, University of (Dept. of Mass Comm.) [200]	N							N		
IL	DePaul University (Communication) [400]	N							N		
IA	Drake University (School of Journ. & Mass Comm.) [450 u.g.; 50 grad.]	Y	IC ES	Survey	1973	?	Y/N	Not sure what it measures.			
TN	East Tennessee State University (Communication Dept.) [370]	Y	S ES	ACT achievement test for Sr's. Locally prepared test for Speech & M.C. majors.	1986	Can't machine score SP & MC tests.	N	Writing skills aren't tested.			
IL	Eastern Illinois Univ. (Dept. of Journalism) [179]	Y	IC	Non-standardized finals.			Y		N		
KY	Eastern Kentucky Univ. (Dept. of Mass Comm.) [350+]			Idea form					N		
NM	Eastern New Mexico University (Comm. Arts & Sciences) [15]	N							Y		
PA	Elizabethtown College (Communications) [160]	Y	IC S ES SA	Final exams as required; Sr. research & applied project. Oral defense.	1984	N	Y	Under continuous refinement.			
NJ	Fairleigh Dickinson University (Comm. & Speech) [135]	Y	IC EY	Univ. developed student course eval. form.		Appl. merit pay, Fac. eval. or teaching tool	N	Norms & validity			
FL	Florida A&M University (College of Journ, Media & Graphic Arts) [191]			Standard testing at end of semester.			Y		N		
IN	Franklin College (School of Journalism) [125]	N							N		
NJ	Glassboro State College (Comm. Dept.) [600]	N							N		
IN	Goshen College (Dept. of Comm.) [60]	Y	SA	Course evaluation; Sr. portfolio or recital.		Highly subjective.			Y	No specific instrument.	

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
HI	Hawaii, Univ. of (Dept. of Comm.) [500]	Y	IC ES	Open & closed question-naires.	1981 1982	Budget	Y		N		
ID	Idaho State University (Dept. of Mass Comm.) [90]	N							Y	?	
IL	Illinois, Univ. of @ Champaign (College of Comm.) [550]	N			Approx. 1973	ambig-uous	N	Not fair			
IN	Indiana State Univ. @ Terre Haute (Communication) [450 u.g.; 50 grad.]	Y	IC	Instructors create their own.		1) Inappropriate to content and/or level of learning; Measures only cognitive learning.	N	2) None available for file.	Y	Com-muni-cations competence assessment.	
IN	Indiana University @ Bloomington (School of Journalism) [650]	N							N		
IA	Iowa State University (Journ. & Mass Comm.) [600]	Y		Course evalua-tions.	1982	Time & Cost	Y		N		
IA	Iowa, University of (Dept. of Journ. & MC) [650]	Y	IC	Prof. design their own.			Sort of.	Poorly made.	N		
FL	Jacksonville Univ. (Dept. of Communication) [125]	Y	SA	Culminating course, comm. seminar.	1987	None	Y				
VA	James Madison Univ. (Dept. of Comm.) [650]	N							Y		Spring 1988
AR	John Brown University Dept. Communications) [3]	N							Y	Still looking.	
NC	Johnson C. Smith Univ. (Comm. Arts Dept.) [100]								Y	Will construct their own.	
KS	Kansas State Univ. (Journ. & M.C.) [600]	N							N		
NE	Kearney State College (Telecommunications) [110]	N							N		
OH	Kent State University (School of Journ. and Mass Comm.) [1,100]	N							Y		
KY	Kentucky, Univ. of, (School of Journ.) [550]	N	None						Possibly		
MO	Lincoln University (Communications) [60]	N							Y	Being developed by faculty to evaluate graduating seniors.	1989

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
MN	Mankato State Univ. (M.C. Institute) [210]	N							N		
SD	Marist College (Comm. Arts) [585]	N							N		
WI	Marquette University (Broadcast Comm.) [195]	N							N		
MD	Maryland, Univ. of (Dept. of Comm. Arts & Theatre) [800]								N		
MO	Maryville College @ St. Louis (Dept. of Comm.)	N							Y		
MA	Massachusetts, Univ. of @ Amherst (Dept. of Comm.) [1,300]	Y	IC	Course eval.	?	Logistics	N				
MN	Minnesota, Univ. of (Journ. & M.C.) [332]	Y	IC SA	Standard college form/ survey	? Many years	Lack of coop. by profs.	Y				
MS	Mississippi State U. (Dept. of Comm.) [420]	N							N		
MO	Missouri, Univ. of @ St. Louis (Dept. of Comm.) [300]	Y	SA	Univ. constructed	April 1988	Rush, lack of pre-test, etc.				GRE CCAI (SCA)	
MO	Missouri Western State College (Comm. Studies, Theatre, Humanities) [35]	N							Y		
MT	Montana, Univ. of (R/TV Dept. /School of Journalism) [77/176]	Y	IC each quarter.	Self-designed eval. form.	1984	Fac. contract states only required once per yr.	Y				
SD	Mount Marty College (Communication Arts) [5]	N							Y	Undecided.	
KY	Murray State Univ. (Dept. of Journ./RTV) [320]	N							Y	Working on one.	Fall '88
NV	Nevada, Las Vegas University of (Communication Studies) [250]								N		
NV	Nevada, Reno, Univ. of (Speech Comm. & Theatre) [90]	N							N		
NH	New Hampshire, Univ. of (Dept. of Comm.) [450]	Y	IC ES	Exams, papers, projects, quizzes.			Y		N		

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
NM	New Mexico, Univ. of (Dept. of Journalism) [116]	N							Y	?	
NY	Niagara University (Comm. Studies Prog.) [118]	Y	EY	Personal & Dept. analysis.	?		Y				
VA	Norfolk State Univ. (Dept. of Journalism) [90]	Y	S TU	Custom designed.	1987	To establish accurate addresses.	Y				
NC	North Carolina, Univ.of @ Asheville (Dept. of Mass Comm.) [105]	Y	TU SA	Essay comp. exam & oral def. of Sr. project.	1982	Students hate it.	Y				
NC	North Carolina, Univ. of @ Chapel Hill (Speech Communication) [300]	Y	IC	Student eval.; Dept. mid-sem. eval.	Always	N	Y				
ND	North Dakota, Univ. of (School of Comm.) [425]	N							N		
ND	North Dakota State U. (Dept. Mass Comm.) [200]										
TX	North Texas State U. (Comm. & Pub. Add.) [175 u.g.; 60 grad.]	Y	IC	Stan. exams/ perf.levels			N				
LA	Northeast Louisiana U. (Dept. of Comm. Arts) [400 u.g.; 60 grads.]	Y	IC S SA	Exams: comp., oral & written.	1930s 1950s		Y				
MO	Northeast Missouri State University (Dept. Mass Comm.) [200]	Y	SA	Coop exam	1973	N	N	Focus is on grammar and word usage; not content.	Y	GRE ?	
MA	Northeastern Univ. (Dept. of Speech Comm.) [400]	N							N		
AZ	Northern Arizona Univ. (School of Comm.) [700]	Y	IC	Finals					Y	Sequence @ EY	
CO	Northern Colorado, University of (Journ. & Mass Comm.) [350]	N							Y		June '89
IA	Northern Iowa, Univ. of, (Comm./Theatre Arts) [650]	Y	IC ES	Univ. designed	1977		N	Not discipline specific.			
LA	Northwestern State Univ. of Louisiana (Language Arts) [100]	Y	IC ES	Finals	Always		Y		N		
MI	Oakland University (Rhetoric, Comm. and Journalism) [500]	Y	IC ES	Student eval.			Y & N		N		

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
OH	Ohio Wesleyan Univ. (Dept. of Journalism) [85]	N							N		
WA	Pacific Lutheran Univ. (Dept. of Comm. Arts) [130]	N							Y	Indiv. writing & speaking.	In approx. 2-yrs.
CA	Pacific, Univ. of (Dept. of Comm.) [250]	N							N		
TX	Pan American Univ. (English Dept.) [120]	Y	IC TU	Dept. exams.	1978		Y				
TX	Prairie View A&M U. (Communications) [160]								No, but Univ. is considering it.		
IL	Roosevelt University (Dept. of Journ.) [150]	Y	IC		1983		Sort of.	Validation.			
NJ	Rutgers University (Dept. of Comm.) [?]	Y	IC TU	Final exams, survey alumni.			Y				
CA	San Diego State Univ. (Journalism) [1,200]	N							N		
CA	San Francisco State U. (Broadcast Comm. Arts) [800+]	Y	IC	Grades							
CA	San Francisco, Univ.of (Communication Arts) [163]								N		
SD	South Dakota State U. (Dept. of Journ.) [250]	Y	ES	Currently ACT	1986		N	Measures wrong things	Y	Create own.	
FL	South Florida, Univ. of (Dept. of M.C.) [620]	N							N		
IL	Southern Illinois, University of @ Edwardsville (Dept. M.C.) [260]								Y	Prelim. stage.	
IL	Southern Illinois, University of @ Carbondale (School of Journ.) [443]	N							Y	?	
LA	Southern Louisiana U. [65]	Y	IC ES	Questionaires.	1973	Types of ? scoring.	N		?		
MS	Southern Mississippi University of (Radio, TV and Film) [190]	N							Y	Evaluating methods at present.	1990?
KS	St. Mary of the Plains College (Dept. of M.C.) [2]	Y	IC	Chosen by admin.	?	?	N	Neg. in avg. & not indiv.	Y	In process.	

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
MN	St. Mary's College (Dept. of M.C.) [45]								N		
MN	St. Thomas, College of (Dept. of Journ. & M C) [200]	N							N		
TX	Stephen F. Austin State University (Comm. Dept.) [650]	Y	IC	Comp. exam for master's.	At start of MA program.	N	Y		N		
PA	Temple University (Dept. of Journ.) [950]	Y	IC	Dept.-wide exam.	1983	Sub-jectiv-ity.	Y				
TN	Tennessee University @ Chattanooga (Dept. of Comm.) [300+]	Y	SA	ACT comp.	Within last 5-yrs.		N	Does not measure "gen. ed."	Y	Dept. prepared test.	1990-91
TN	Tennessee Tech. Univ. (English/Journ.) [80]	Y	SA	Perf. testing	1987		Y				
TX	Texas @ Arlington, University of (Dept. of Comm.) [1020]	N							N		
TX	Texas @ Austin, University of (College of Comm./ Advert.) [3400]	Y		Surveys of grads.							
TX	Texas @ Austin, University of (Dept. of Journ.) [560]	Y	IC TU ES SA	Dept. accredi-tation.	?	N	Y				
TX	Texas @ Permian Basin, University of (Faculty of Comm.) [30]	Y	IC S TU ES EY	Tests			Y		N		
TX	Texas Southern Univ. (Dept. of Comm.) [450]	Y	IC ES	Exams			N	Lacks depth	Y		?
TX	Texas Tech. University (School of Mass Comm.) [1442]	Y	IC ES	Dept. instrument	1980	Agree-ment on criteria.	Y		N		
TX	Texas Wesleyan College (Dept. of M.C.) [96]	N							N		
OH	Toledo, Univ. of (Dept. of Comm.) [575]										
OK	Tulsa, University of (College of Arts and Sciences--Faculty of Communication) [132]	N							N		
UT	Utah, University of (Dept. of Comm.) [156]	Y	IC ES	Course eval.	1968		Y				

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
WA	Walla Walla College (Comm. Dept.) [70]	Y	IC ES	Supplied by Dean's office.	1982	N	Y				
WA	Washington, Univ. of (School of Comm.) [500]	N		Perf. of grads.					N		
VA	Washington & Lee Univ. (Journ. & Comm.) [43]	N									
MI	Wayne State Univ. (Mass Comm.) [350]	N							Y		
UT	Weber State University (Comm. Dept.) [175]								N		
MO	Webster University (Dept. of M.C.) [250 u.g.; 100 grad.]	Y	IC ES	Course instr. eval.	1981		Y				
FL	West Florida, Univ. of (Comm. Arts) [260]								N		
WV	West Virginia, Univ. of (Comm. Studies) [160]								N		
KY	Western Kentucky Univ. (Comm. Dept.) [700]	Y	SA	Specially developed.	Several years ago.		N	Too vague.			
MI	Western Michigan Univ. (Dept. of Comm.) [800]	N							N		
WA	Western Washington Univ (Broadcast Journ.) [135]	Y	IC TU ES	Standard student eval. Prog.assess. by visiting fac.	1966	N	Y		N		
MN	Winona State University (Mass Comm.) [7]								Y		
SC	Winthrop State College (Dept. of M.C.) [?]	N							Y	Still looking.	Req. in a few yrs.
WI	Wisconsin--LaCrosse, University of (Dept. Mass Comm.) [400]	N							N		
WI	Wisconsin--Milwaukee, University of (Dept. Mass Comm.) [129]	Y	IC ES	Teaching eval.	1970		Y				
WI	Wisconsin--Oshkosh, University of (Radio, TV, Film area/ Dept. of Comm.) [336]	N							Y	Not specific.	
WI	Wisconsin--River Falls University of (Journalism) [122]	Y	IC TU SA	Teacher eval.,job surv. of grads.			Y				

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
OH	Wright State Univ. (Dept. of Comm.) [450]	N							Y	Using SCA for assistance.	
OH	Xavier University (Comm. Arts) [300]	N									
OH	Youngstown State Univ. (Speech Comm./Theatre) [250]	N							Y	?	

LATE RESPONSES

AL	Alabama, Univ. of (School of Comm.) [1641]			Accred-itation process	5 yrs	N	N	Regularly seeking opinions	N		
NY	Albany, State Univ. of New York at, (Dept. of English)										
AK	Arkansas State Univ. (College of Comm.) [550]	N							Y		
MO	Evangel College (Dept. of Comm.) [190]	N							Y	In talking stage	
MA	Emerson College (Div. of M.C.) [1050]	N							Y		
DC	George Washington U. (Comm. Dept.) [210]	N							N		
CA	Humboldt State Univ. (Dept. Speech Comm.) [70]	N						May be forced to implement.			
LA	Iowa State Univ. (Journ. & M.C.) [600]										
MO	Lindenwood College (Comm. Dept.) [90]								N		
IL	Loyola, University of in Chicago (Dept. of Comm.) [650]	N							Y		
LA	Loyola University @ New Orleans (Dept. of Comm.) [650]	Y	IC ES	Exams, papers, projects			Y		N		
PA	Pennsylvania, Univ. of (Annenberg School of Communications) [150 grad.]								N		
CA	San Jose State Univ. (Dept. of Journ.& M.C.) [1100]	N							Y	?	

	University/College Academic Unit # of majors	Currently use assessments	Types used	Instruments used	Date utilized	Obstacles	Is it adequate?	Shortcomings	Are considering using outcomes	Proposed instrument	Date to be implemented
SD	South Dakota, Univ. of (M.C. Dept.) [210]	N		None					Y	Self-designed	ASAP
MO	Southeast Missouri State University (Dept. of Mass Comm.) [366]	Y	IC ES	Dept. created	1985	N	N		Y		ASAP
MA	Suffolk University (Dept. Journ. & Comm.) [104]	N							N		
IL	Western Illinois Univ. (Dept. of CATS) [600]	N		Alumni surveys	1979	N			Y		

CODE:

I C = Individual classes
S = Sequences
T U = Total unit
E S = Conclusion of each semester
E Y = Conclusion of each academic year
S A = Conclusion of a student's academic experience